

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-1593

ABDUL AZIZ KHAN; HINA PARVEEN; ABDUL MAJEED
KHAN; MUHAMMAD FAREED KHAN; NIDA PERVEEN;
ZAHIDA PERVEEN,

Petitioners,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General of the United
States,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration
Appeals. (A79-512-383; A79-512-388; A-79-512-387; A79-512-386; A79-
512-385; A79-512-384)

Submitted: November 19, 2004

Decided: December 29, 2004

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John E. Gallagher, Catonsville, Maryland, for Petitioners. Peter
D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, James A. Hunolt, Senior
Litigation Counsel, M. Jocelyn Lopez Wright, Office of Immigration
Litigation, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C.,
for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).
PER CURIAM:

Abdul Aziz Khan ("Khan") and his wife, Zahida Perveen, and their four children, Nida and Hina Perveen and Abdul Majeed and Muhammad Fareed Khan, natives and citizens of Pakistan, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("Board") order affirming, without opinion, the immigration judge's decision denying asylum and withholding of removal and denying relief under the Convention Against Torture. For the reasons discussed below, we deny the petition for review.*

The decision to grant or deny asylum relief is conclusive "unless manifestly contrary to the law and an abuse of discretion." 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(D) (2000). We have reviewed the immigration judge's decision and the administrative record and find the record supports the conclusion Khan failed to establish past persecution or a well founded fear of persecution. See 8 C.F.R. § 1208.13(a) (2004) (stating that the burden of proof is on the alien to establish his eligibility for asylum); INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 483 (1992). Because the decision in this case is not manifestly contrary to law, we cannot grant the relief Khan and his family seek.

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions

*The Petitioners do not challenge the immigration judge's denial of the applications for withholding of removal and relief under the Convention Against Torture.

are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED